UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.             | FILING DATE                | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/767,251                  | 01/28/2004                 | Gerry R. Boss        | 26774-14267         | 4781             |
| 758<br>FENWICK & V          | 7590 05/05/201<br>VEST LLP | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| SILICON VAL<br>801 CALIFORI | LEY CENTER                 | YU, MELANIE J        |                     |                  |
|                             | YIEW, CA 94041             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                             |                            |                      | 1641                |                  |
|                             |                            |                      |                     |                  |
|                             |                            |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                             |                            |                      | 05/05/2010          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |  |  |
|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/767,251      | BOSS ET AL.  |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit     |  |  |
| MELANIE YU      | 1641         |  |  |

|   | WELANIE TO   | 1041  |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the d  | correspondence add  | ress                                     |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>23 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI   | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A  | LLOWANCE.   |  |
| <ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on<br/>application, applicant must timely file one of the following r<br/>application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe<br/>for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C<br/>periods:</li> </ol>  | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi<br>al (with appeal fee) in compliance         | t, or other evidence, v<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; o           | hich places the (3) a Request            |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing  | date of the final rejection.   |   |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la  | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing   | g date of the final rejection                             | n.                                       |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f   | ).   |   |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount<br>hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropri-<br>nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |
| 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compl   | iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be  | filed within two month                                    | s of the date of                         |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi  | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                                    |  |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u>   |  |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>   | sideration and/or search (see NO   |   | cause                                    |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  | **   |   |  |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or   |  |   | ne issues for                            |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c  | orresponding number of finally reje  | ected claims.   |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  |  |   |  |
| 4. $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$  |  | mpliant Amendment (                                       | PTOL-324).                               |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |  |   |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   |  |   | _  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  |  | l be entered and an e                                     | xplanation of                            |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12 and 26-37</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |   |  |
| 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but  | hafara ar an tha data of filing a Ne   | ation of Apparatually                                     | · ha antarad                             |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).   |  |   |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary  | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea  | al and/or appellant fail                                  | s to provide a                           |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br/><u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u></li> </ol>   | of the status of the claims after e  | ntry is below or attach                                   | ed.                                      |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br/>See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>   | does NOT place the application in  | condition for allowan                                     | ce because:                              |
| 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (   | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)   |   |  |
| 13.  Other:   |  |   |  |
|   | /Melanie Yu/<br>Primary Examiner, Art U  | Init 1641   |  |
|   | <i>,</i> —   |   |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: for the reasons stated in the previous office action dated 24 February 2010.

Applicant argues that Glad does not teach partially melting an inner wall of a substrate of the test tube with a plurality of beads. Applicant further argues that the references of Orth et al., Stimpson et al., Zhang, Liu et al., LaMotte, Schall et al., Hendriks, Leach et al., Sivaraja and Neumann et al. fail to teach partiallymelting an inner wall of the test tube and coating the partially melted inner wall with a plurality of beads.

Applicant's argument is not persuasive because Wolfbeis is relied upon for teaching this limitation, and therefore these references are not relied upon the limitation of partially melting an inner wall.

Applicant further argues that Wolfbeis teaches coating a piece of glass with a powder or gel and then sintering it for 40 minutes, and therefore does not teach partially melting an inner wall of at est tube and coating the partially melted inner wall of the test tube with a plurality of beads. Applicant argues that instead, Wolfbeis teaches performing these method steps in the reverse order (coating with particles then heating).

Applicant's argument is not persuasive because the claim does not recite a specific order of method steps. Wolfbeis teaches the steps of partially melting a glass substrate and also teaches a coating of a plurality of beads on a partially melted glass substrate as required by claim 1. Even though the particles are sprinkled on the substrate prior to heating, the coating is not performed until the particles have become partially embedded in the substrate. The particles are pressed into the glass after the glass has been partially melted, thus step of coating the beads as described in instant claim 1 occurs only after the partially melting step has been performed (claim 6, lines 50-60). Additionally, Wolfbeis teaches blowing off excess particles after heating to form the coating of particles. Therefore, Wolfbeis is interpreted as performing the coating step when the particles are partially embedded in the substrate, which occurs only after a step of partially melting.